

1 REMARKS

2 Status of the Claims

3 Claims 1-11 and 13-26 remain pending in the application, Claim 12 having been cancelled,  
4 Claim 11 having been amended to more clearly define the present invention, and  
5 Claims 1-3, 7, 10, 13, and 23 having been amended to correct stylistic errors and other non-  
6 substantive errors unrelated to the patentability of these claims.

7 Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Courtner

8 The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 11-13, 16-18, and 20 as being anticipated by Courtner  
9 et al. ("Mastering Microsoft Office 2000, Professional Edition," Sybex, copyright 04/1999 hereinafter  
10 referred to as "Courtner"). The Examiner asserts that Courtner teaches each element of applicants'  
11 claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons discussed below.

12 In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in this  
13 response, the following discussion focuses on independent Claims 1 and 11. The patentability of  
14 each remaining dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However,  
15 applicants' decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim  
16 should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's conclusion that  
17 these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references. Similarly,  
18 applicants' decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim element, or every  
19 comment made by the Examiner, should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur  
20 with the Examiner's interpretation and assertions regarding those claims. Indeed, applicants believe  
21 that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the references cited. However, a specific  
22 traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since dependent claims are  
23 patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims  
24 ultimately depend.

25 With regard to independent Claim 1, applicants' method for validating information in an  
26 electronic document is neither taught nor suggested by Courtner because Courtner does not associate  
27 a unique identifier with a string, as recited by applicants in Claim 1. According to applicants'  
28 specification, "a string can be associated with a unique identifier that can be used to validate the  
29 string" (see applicants' specification, page 15, lines 15-16). Furthermore, the unique identifier may  
30 indicate that the information that is being requested to validate the string is a stock quote (see

1 applicants' specification, page 15, lines 31-33). Or the unique identifier may indicate that the  
2 information being requested to validate the string is an address book (see applicants' specification,  
3 page 15, lines 25-27). Thus, it can be inferred that a unique identifier is a type of information  
4 associated with a string, and the information can be used to validate the string. Further, a unique  
5 identifier also indicates the context in which a string is being used.

6 The Examiner asserts that Courtner anticipates the first step of Claim 1, i.e., the step of  
7 identifying a string having a unique identifier associated with the string, since Courtner "teaches that  
8 Microsoft Word 2000 will flag possibly misspelled words as you type by placing a wavy red line  
9 underneath them" (Office Action, page 2). However, the Examiner's assertion fails to recognize that  
10 there are two parts to the first step of Claim 1. In the first part, the string must be identified, and in  
11 the second part, the string must have a unique identifier associated with the string. The Examiner has  
12 not made it clear which part that "the wavy red line" represents. There is nothing unique about a  
13 wavy red line, since the wavy red lines applied to each apparently misspelled word all look alike.  
14 Accordingly, it appears that the Examiner is suggesting that the wavy red lines must identify a string,  
15 as opposed to being a unique identifier. Assuming *arguendo*, that a wavy red line is used for  
16 "identifying a string," as discussed above, Courtner lacks any teaching or suggestion of the second  
17 part of the first step of Claim 1. In other words, Courtner fails to teach or suggest that the string has a  
18 unique identifier associated with the string, since the wavy red line is not uniquely associated with a  
19 specific misspelled word.

20 The Examiner also asserts that Courtner anticipates the second step of Claim 1, i.e., the step  
21 of creating a request for information associated with the unique identifier, since Courtner also teaches  
22 "that to correct possibly misspelled words, all you have to do is right-click on a flagged word to open  
23 the Spell It shortcut menu, which lists suggestions for the proper spelling (Office Action, page 2).  
24 However, the second step of Claim 2 also has two parts. First, a request must be created. Second,  
25 this request must request information associated with the unique identifier. Assuming, *arguendo*, that  
26 clicking on a word that has been flagged with the wavy red line is equivalent to creating a request for  
27 information (such as a suggestion for determining a proper spelling), Courtner still does not teach  
28 requesting information *associated with the unique identifier*, because there is no unique identifier in  
29 Courtner, as discussed above in connection with the first step of Claim 1.

30 ///

1 Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion in Courtner that any request for information  
2 associated with right clicking on a word is based on the context in which a string is being used, which  
3 as described above, is in accord with applicants' definition of one of the functions of the unique  
4 identifier. For example, if applicants were to employ a dictionary as a reference material source in  
5 order to check spelling, the unique identifier associated with the string that is identified access  
6 information pertinent to the context of the paragraph in which the identified string is located.

7 As a further example, if the user is typing a paragraph about cooking and types the term  
8 "bomme" to describe a dessert consisting of two or more layers of ice cream frozen in a mold, the  
9 unique identifier will ensure that information (such as its correct spelling) is returned that is relevant  
10 to the context in which the word is being used. In other words, the unique identifier ensures that only  
11 correct spellings of similar words related to cooking are returned. Based upon this context  
12 sensitivity, the spelling options presented will not include "bomb," because an explosive device is not  
13 in the context of cooking. Instead, the spelling options presented might include "bombe" or  
14 "bommes," because these terms relate to cooking.

15 Applicants' invention is unlike Courtner, because Courtner is simply a spell checker that flags  
16 possibly misspelled words. Because Courtner does not provide a unique identifier, it does not know  
17 the context in which the words are used, and hence, cannot suggest alternative correct spellings only  
18 for words within that context. Courtner thus presents the user with several choices of correctly  
19 spelled words without regard for the context of the paragraph in which the misspelled word is being  
20 used. Unlike applicants' invention, Courtner is unable to propose only *context appropriate* correctly  
21 spelled words to replace a misspelled word (see applicants' specification, page 1, lines 28-31).  
22 Accordingly, the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Courtner should be  
23 withdrawn for the reasons given above.

24 Independent Claim 11 has been amended and now recites a step drawn from canceled  
25 Claim 12, so that it more clearly distinguishes over Courtner. Regarding Claim 12, the Examiner  
26 asserts that Courtner teaches the electronic document includes a string having a unique identifier  
27 associated with the string, and indicates that the request for information comprises the unique  
28 identifier, because Microsoft Word 2000 will flag possibly misspelled words as they are typed, by  
29 placing a wavy red line underneath them (Office Action, page 4). Applicants have already shown  
30 that this argument is without merit. Therefore, for the same reasons presented above in traversing the

1 rejection of Claim 1, amended Claim 11 clearly distinguishes over Courtner. Accordingly, the  
2 rejection of independent Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Courtner should be withdrawn.

3 Because dependent claims are considered to include all of the elements of the independent  
4 claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend and because Courtner does not disclose or  
5 suggest all of the elements of independent Claims 1 and 11, the rejection of dependent Claims 2 and 3  
6 and 13, 16-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Courtner should be withdrawn for at least the  
7 same reasons as set forth in the traverse of the rejections of Claim 1 and 11.

8 Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Halstead

9 The Examiner has rejected Claims 7-8 as being anticipated by Halstead et al. (U.S. Patent  
10 No. 6,363,392 hereinafter referred to as "Halstead"). The Examiner asserts that Halstead teaches  
11 each element of applicants' claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons  
12 discussed below.

13 In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in this  
14 response, the following discussion focuses on independent Claim 7. The patentability of each  
15 remaining dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail, for the reasons explained  
16 above.

17 With regard to independent Claim 7, applicants' method for providing reference material is  
18 neither taught nor suggested by Halstead because Halstead neither determines that the identity of a  
19 user is relevant to the selected reference material nor provides the selected reference material in a  
20 manner that is relevant to the identified user. For example, if a user desires directions, then the  
21 identity of the user is relevant as an indication of the user's location, since the directions should be  
22 given relative to the user's location (see applicants' specification, page 16, lines 15-19).

23 The Examiner asserts that Halstead anticipates the six steps of applicants' Claim 7 because  
24 Halstead teaches a method and system for providing a flexible, sharable database with proximity  
25 searching capability, and in support of this rejection, the Examiner cites the first two paragraphs of  
26 the Overview section (Halstead, column 3, lines 35-56). However, the Examiner has not explained  
27 how the 21 lines cited in Halstead are equivalent to the steps in applicants' Claim 7. Specifically, this  
28 portion of Halstead fails to mention a user and does not teach or suggest the importance of the user's  
29 identity. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the Examiner may have intended to assert that the first step  
30 of Claim 7, i.e., the step of receiving a request for selected reference material, is equivalent to the

1 reference's teaching that a "user request may be received to view the database" (column 4,  
2 lines 65-67) and that the third, fourth, and fifth steps of Claim 7 are equivalent to Halstead's teaching  
3 that "a user request may be received to view the database (column 4, lines 65-66) where the selected  
4 reference material source may be the Internet and World Wide Web (column 3, lines 41-42), and that  
5 the user is identified because the user has to log on (Halstead, Figure 3), there is still no teaching or  
6 suggestion in Halstead of the second and sixth steps of Claim 7, which recite "determining that an  
7 identity of a user is relevant to the selected reference material," and "providing the selected reference  
8 material in a manner that is relevant to the identified user." Instead, in Halstead, when the user  
9 requests to view the database, the database manager locates the name of the database in a metatable,  
10 and based on the preferences in metadata corresponding to the name of the database, the database  
11 manger formats the database for viewing on a web page (see column 4, lines 66-67 – column 5,  
12 lines 1-3 of Halstead). The formatting may be based on metadata that contain any subsequent  
13 customization requested by the user (see column 4, lines 20-22 of Halstead). Thus, Halstead fails to  
14 teach or suggest that the selected reference material is provided in a *manner relevant to the user*.  
15 Accordingly, the rejection of independent Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Halstead should be  
16 withdrawn.

17 Because dependent claims are considered to include all of the elements of the independent  
18 claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend and because Halstead does not disclose or  
19 suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 7, the rejection of dependent Claim 8, under  
20 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Halstead should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as the rejections  
21 of Claim 7.

#### 22 Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Computer Concepts

23 The Examiner has rejected Claims 23-25 as being anticipated by Computer Concepts  
24 (<http://www.cconcepts.co.uk/products/wordw.htm>, 05/19/1997 last update to page, hereinafter  
25 referred to as "CC"). The Examiner asserts that CC teaches each element of applicants' claimed  
26 invention. Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons discussed below.

27 Again, in the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in  
28 this response, the following discussion focuses on independent Claim 23. The patentability of each  
29 remaining dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, as already  
30 explained, applicants' decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each

1 dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's  
2 conclusion that these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references  
3 or that applicants concur with the Examiner's interpretation and assertions regarding those claims.

4 With regard to independent Claim 23, applicants' method for integrating a dictionary into an  
5 application program is neither taught nor suggested by CC because CC does not integrate a dictionary  
6 into the application program. In contrast, applicants' preamble states "a method for *integrating* a  
7 dictionary into an application program." Furthermore, the first step of Claim 23 recites "*in response*  
8 *to a selection of a dictionary control provided by the application program*, displaying a dictionary  
9 interface on a display device. Thus, when the user is operating **within an application program**,  
10 there is a control **within the application program** that is selectable to access a dictionary, causing a  
11 dictionary interface to be displayed.

12 In contrast, the Examiner asserts that CC anticipates all six steps of applicants' Claim 23 and  
13 cites two paragraphs from page 1 of the CC reference in support of his assertion. The Examiner does  
14 not explain how these two paragraphs anticipate each step of Claim 23. In any case, it is apparent  
15 that CC is a *stand-alone* application (CC, page 1, lines 1-2). Also, this reference states that "once  
16 you've found the word or phrase you want, simply double click on it to transfer the selected word to  
17 your word processor..." (CC, page 1, lines 10-12). Thus, CC is not integrated with a word processor  
18 that provides a dictionary control that is selected to cause the dictionary interface to be displayed.  
19 Instead, CC is a separate program, as shown by the figure on page 2 of the CC reference, which  
20 indicates that a user can type a word in a dialog of this separate program (which is entirely **outside of**  
21 **the application program**) and be provided with a definition. Accordingly, CC is not equivalent to  
22 applicants' claimed invention, and the rejection of independent Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)  
23 over CC should be withdrawn.

24 Because dependent claims are considered to include all of the elements of the independent  
25 claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend and because CC does not disclose or  
26 suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 23, the rejection of dependent Claims 24-25, under  
27 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over CC should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as the rejection of  
28 Claim 23.

29 ///

30 ///

1 Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Courtner

2 Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtner.  
3 However, Claims 4-6 depend from independent Claim 1, which is patentable for the reasons  
4 discussed above. And because dependent claims are considered to include all of the elements of the  
5 independent claims from which the dependent claims depend, dependent Claims 4-6 are patentable  
6 for at least the reasons discussed above in regard to independent Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection  
7 of dependent Claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

8 Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Halstead in view of Abrams

9 Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halstead in  
10 view of Abrams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,350, hereinafter referred to as "Abrams"). However,  
11 Claims 9 and 10 depend from independent Claim 7, which is patentable for the reasons discussed  
12 above. Thus, dependent Claims 9 and 10 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above  
13 with regard to independent Claim 7. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 9 and 10 under  
14 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

15 Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Courtner in view of Halstead

16 Claims 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtner  
17 in view of Halstead. However, Claims 14 and 19 depend from independent Claim 11, which is  
18 patentable for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 14  
19 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

20 Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Courtner in view of CC

21 Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtner in view of  
22 CC. However, Claim 15 depends from independent Claim 11, which is patentable for the reasons  
23 discussed above. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should  
24 be withdrawn.

25 Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Courtner in view of Abrams

26 Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtner  
27 in view of Abrams. However, Claims 21 and 22 depend from independent Claim 11, which is  
28 patentable for the reasons discussed above. Dependent Claims 21 and 22 are patentable for at least  
29 the same reasons discussed above with regard to independent Claim 11, and the rejection of  
30 dependent Claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

1 Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Poirier

2 Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over CC in view of  
3 Poirier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,321,372 hereinafter referred to as "Poirier"). However, Claim 26  
4 depends from independent Claim 23, which is patentable for the reasons discussed above. Therefore,  
5 dependent Claim 26 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to  
6 independent Claim 23, and the rejection of dependent Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be  
7 withdrawn.

8 In view of the amendments and Remarks set forth above, it will be apparent that the claims in  
9 this application define a novel and non-obvious invention. The application is in condition for  
10 allowance and should be passed to issue without further delay. Should any further questions remain,  
11 the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

12  
13 Respectfully submitted,

14 *Ron Anderson*

15  
16 Ronald M. Anderson  
17 Registration No. 28,829  
18

19 RMA/SKM:lrg

20 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed  
21 envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 10, 2004.

22 Date: August 10, 2004

23 *Kathy Paurin*  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30